

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FIFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

In re SANTOS V., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

SANTOS V.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F051756

(Super. Ct. No. 03JQ0161D)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Kings County. George L. Orndoff, Judge.

Donn Ginoza, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Edmund G. Brown, Jr., Attorney General, Dane R. Gillette, Chief Assistant Attorney General, Michael P. Farrell, Assistant Attorney General, and Charles A. French, Deputy Attorney General, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

*Before Levy, Acting P.J., Cornell, J. and Dawson, J.

It was alleged in a juvenile wardship petition (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) filed June 8, 2006,¹ that appellant Santos V., a minor, committed grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a)). The petition gave notice of intent to aggregate confinement periods for offenses of which appellant had been adjudicated in prior proceedings. On June 20, appellant denied the grand theft allegation. On August 17, following a jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court found the allegation true. On October 3, following the disposition hearing, the court readjudged appellant a ward of the juvenile court; declared the instant offense to be a felony; ordered appellant committed to the Kings County Bravo Boot Camp program for a period of not more than one year and not less than 150 days; declared appellant's maximum period of physical confinement to be five years six months, based on the instant offense and offenses adjudicated in previous wardship proceedings; awarded appellant credit for 304 days for time served; and placed appellant on probation, with various terms and conditions.

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief which summarizes the pertinent facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks that this court independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

FACTS

Prosecution Case

Appellant was working at a McDonald's restaurant (the restaurant) on May 7. He was stationed at a drive-through window where his duties included taking money from customers, placing it in the cash register, and making change. At 4:19 p.m., as appellant approached the end of his shift, a manager counted the cash in the drawer at the work station where appellant had been working and discovered that the amount of cash in the drawer was \$514.94 less than the restaurant's computerized receipts-tracking system indicated should have been there.

¹All references to dates of events are to dates in 2006.

On the afternoon of May 7, appellant's uncle drove up to the drive-through window where appellant was working; also in the car were appellant's sister, Vicki V., and another family member. The group ordered food; Vicki handed appellant some money in payment; and, she testified, appellant gave her change in the correct amount.

Police Officer James Adams testified he interviewed Vicki on May 8, at which time she told him that in her transaction at the restaurant the previous day appellant handed her a "large amount" of money and that the amount was "more than what she would have expected in change."

Jayden P. testified to the following. He was employed by the restaurant as an assistant manager on May 7. At some point after May 7, appellant telephoned him and asked, "If I give you money, will you be able to put it in the safe[?]"

Defense Case

Appellant testified to the following. He did not steal over \$500 from the restaurant. On May 7, Vicki purchased food from him at the drive-through window where he was working. She handed him a \$100 bill and he gave her the correct change, approximately \$25 or \$30. Jayden P.'s testimony, summarized above, was untrue.

Vicki denied she told Officer Adams that the money she received back from appellant was more than the correct amount of change.

DISCUSSION

Following independent review of the record, we have concluded that no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues exist.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.